



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

TRe

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/992,155	11/05/2001	Modesto Tabares	9209-10	5291
20792	7590	05/16/2006	[REDACTED]	EXAMINER
MYERS BIGEL SIBLEY & SAJOVEC PO BOX 37428 RALEIGH, NC 27627			[REDACTED]	CAO, DIEM K
			[REDACTED]	ART UNIT
			[REDACTED]	PAPER NUMBER
				2194

DATE MAILED: 05/16/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/992,155	TABARES ET AL.
	Examiner Diem K. Cao	Art Unit 2194

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 01 March 2006.  
 2a) This action is FINAL.                    2b) This action is non-final.  
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-15,20-34 and 39-53 is/are pending in the application.  
 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.  
 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.  
 6) Claim(s) 1-6,9-15,20-25,28-34,39-44,47-53m is/are rejected.  
 7) Claim(s) 7,8,26,27,45 and 46 is/are objected to.  
 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.  
 10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).  
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119


12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
 a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:  
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_.  
 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)  
 6) Other: \_\_\_\_\_



WILLIAM THOMSON  
 SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

**DETAILED ACTION**

1. Claims 1-15, 20-34 and 39-53 are pending.
  
2. In view of the Appeal Brief filed on 3/1/2006, PROSECUTION IS HEREBY REOPENED. A new ground of rejection is set forth below.

To avoid abandonment of the application, appellant must exercise one of the following two options:

- (1) file a reply under 37 CFR 1.111 (if this Office action is non-final) or a reply under 37 CFR 1.113 (if this Office action is final); or,
- (2) request reinstatement of the appeal.

If reinstatement of the appeal is requested, such request must be accompanied by a supplemental appeal brief, but no new amendments, affidavits (37 CFR 1.130, 1.131 or 1.132) or other evidence are permitted. See 37 CFR 1.193(b)(2).

***Allowable Subject Matter***

3. Claims 7-8, 26-27 and 45-46 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

**5. Claims 1, 2, 10, 12, 13, 15, 20, 21, 29, 31, 32, 34, 39, 40, 48, 50, 51 and 53 are rejected**

**under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Camara et al (U.S. 2002/0059474 A1).**

6. As to claim 1, Camara teaches dynamically associating a first software component with the device driver at run-time (page 4, paragraph 34 and page 3, paragraph 22), the first software component containing information that facilitates communication with devices of a specific device type (page 3, paragraph 34 and page 4, paragraph 32).

7. As to claim 2, Camara teaches defining a plurality of device parameters (page 4, paragraph 36 and page 9, examples 2-4), associating at least one of the plurality of device parameters with a service (page 9, examples 2-4), and communicating the at least one of the plurality of device parameters associated with the service to the device driver (page 4, paragraph 34).

8. As to claim 10, Camara teaches selecting the first software component from a plurality of software components, respective ones of the plurality of software components being associated with respective ones of a plurality of device types (see fig. 2 and pages 2-3, paragraph 20).

Art Unit: 2194

9. As to claim 12, see rejection of claim 1 above. Camara further teaches receiving a request to collect data from the device (page 3, paragraph 27), retrieving data from the device using the device driver (page 3, paragraph 28).

10. As to claim 13, Camara teaches associating at least one device parameter with a service (page 4, paragraph 36 and page 9, examples 2-4), communicating the at least one device parameter to the device driver (page 4, paragraph 34), and retrieving data associated with the at least one device parameter from the device (page 3, paragraph 28).

11. As to claim 15, see rejection of claim 10 above.

12. As to claim 20, it is the same as the method claim of claim 1 and is rejected under the same ground of rejection.

13. As to claim 21, see rejection of claim 2 above.

14. As to claim 29, see rejection of claim 10 above.

15. As to claim 31, it is the same as the method claim 12 and is rejected under the same ground of rejection.

16. As to claims 32 and 34, see rejections of claim 13 and 15.

17. As to claim 39, it is the same as the method claim of claim 1 and is rejected under the same ground of rejection.

18. As to claims 40 and 48, see rejections of claims 2 and 10 above.

19. As to claim 50, it is the same as the method claim 12 and is rejected under the same ground of rejection.

20. As to claims 51 and 53, see rejections of claims 13 and 15 above.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

21. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

**22. Claims 9, 14, 28, 33, 47 and 52 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Camara et al (U.S. 2002/0059474 A1) in view of Martin et al (Professional XML).**

23. As to claim 9, Camara teaches the first software component comprises one of a script file (page 4, section 0036). However, Camara does not teach an extensible markup language. Martin

teaches the advantage of xml when sharing information (page 12). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Camara and Martin because XML language is open, and its self-describing nature makes it an effect choice for multiple solutions (page 12).

24. As to claims 14, 28, 33, 47 and 52, see rejection of claim 9 above.

25. **Claims 3-5, 22-24 and 41-43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Camara et al (U.S. 2002/0059474 A1) in view of Kreissig et al (U.S. 6,473,824 B1).**

26. As to claim 3, Camara does not teach the claimed limitations. However, Carama suggests the first software component could be written in programming language (page 5, paragraph 38). Kreissig teaches declaring a parameter base class that defines the plurality of device parameters (class IOLine 503, the parent class for a digital line; col. 8, lines 14-15 and 20-21), deriving a service-specific sub-class from the base class that defines the at least one of the plurality of device parameters that are associated with the service (IOLineIn, IOLineOut; col. 8, lines 11-15 and 20-21), instantiating the service-specific sub-class to create a service-specific sub-class object (Whenever an IO domain object ... instantiated; col. 9, lines 56-58), and instantiating the parameter base class to create a parameter base class object (Whenever an IO domain object ... instantiated; col. 9, lines 56-58). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Camara and Kreissig because it

provides a flexible, object-oriented approach for establish communication links between an application program and various IO device drivers (col. 2, lines 35-38).

27. As to claim 4, Kreissig teaches passing the at least one of the plurality of device parameters associated with the service from the service-specific sub-class object to the device driver (col. 9, lines 12-22).

28. As to claim 5, Kreissig teaches defining a plurality of common device parameters (class IOLine 503, the parent class for a digital line; col. 8, lines 14-15 and 20-21), defining a plurality of service-specific device parameters (IOLineIn, IOLineOut; col. 8, lines 11-15 and 20-21), associating the common device parameters with the service-specific device parameters (the domain class ... for a digital line; col. 8, lines 13-15 and 20-21), and communicating the common device parameters and the service-specific device parameters to the device driver (col. 9, lines 13-22).

29. As to claims 22-24, see rejections of claims 3-5 above.

30. As to claims 41-43, see rejections of claims 3-5 above.

31. **Claims 11, 30 and 49 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Camara et al (U.S. 2002/0059474 A1) in view of Ramberg et al (U.S. 2005/0034029 A1).**

Art Unit: 2194

32. As to claim 11, Camara does not teach generating the plurality of software components based on a plurality of management information base files, respective ones of the plurality of MIB files being associated with respective ones of the plurality of device types. Ramberg teaches the MIB describes and provides management information for device (page 4, section 0039 and page 5, section 0049). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Camara and Ramberg because it provides a method to create the component based on existing information instead from scratch which will save time and resources.

33. As to claims 30 and 49, see rejection of claim 11 above.

**34. Claims 6, 25 and 44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Camara et al (U.S. 2002/0059474 A1) in view of Kreissig et al (U.S. 6,473,824 B1) further in view of Martin et al (Professional XML).**

35. As to claim 6, Camara teaches the software component that comprises a device script written in any type of script language that includes two files, one is device model data file and the other is a device family data file (page 4, paragraph 0036). Kreissig teaches declaring a parameter base class that defines the plurality of common device parameters (class IOLine 503, the parent class for a digital line; col. 8, lines 14-15 and 20-21), wherein defining the plurality of service-specific device parameters comprises providing a second software component (IOLineIn, IOLineOut; col. 8, lines 11-15 and 20-21), and instantiating the parameter base class to create a

parameter base class object (Whenever an IO domain object ... instantiated; col. 9, lines 56-58).

Martin teaches the advantage of xml when sharing information (page 12). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Kreissig, Camara and Martin because it provides a flexible, object-oriented approach for establish communication links between an application program and various IO device drivers (col. 2, lines 35-38).

36. As to claims 25 and 44, see rejection of claim 6 above.

***Response to Arguments***

37. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-15, 20-34 and 39-53 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

***Conclusion***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Diem K. Cao whose telephone number is (571) 272-3760. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday, 7:30AM - 3:30PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, William Thomson can be reached on (571) 272-3718. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2194


Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

**Any response to this action should be mailed to:**

Commissioner for Patents  
PO Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the TC 2100 Group receptionist at 571-272-2100.

Diem Cao



WILLIAM THOMSON  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

A handwritten signature of "WILLIAM THOMSON" is written in cursive across the top of the typed name. The typed name "WILLIAM THOMSON" is in all caps, and "SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER" is written below it in a smaller font.